

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 2, 1981

The December Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert Patterson at 3:03 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes.

The minutes of the November 4, 1981 Faculty Senate meeting were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of Officers.

No reports.

The CHAIR made three announcements:

1. The Faculty was reminded of the University regulations about the scheduling of examinations during the final classes of the semester and about adherence to the final examination schedule.

2. Faculty were invited to communicate with the Chair the names of potential nominations of faculty members to be considered by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee for nominations at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

3. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate will be in February, there being no January Senate meeting.

III. Reports of Committees.

New  
Committee  
Appointments  
and  
Nominations

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee:

The SECRETARY announced the election of two new members for the Faculty Grade Change Committee: Professors Kenneth Perkins, Department of History and Carol Collison, College of Nursing for three year terms. The SECRETARY placed in nomination for a vacancy on the Faculty House Board of Governors the name of Professor David Husband, Department of Biology.

The CHAIR opened the floor for additional nominations and there were none forthcoming at this time.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Keith D. Berkeley, Chairman:

The report was adopted as submitted.

C. Committee on Curricula and Courses, Professor John L. Safko, Chairman:

PROFESSOR SAFKO announced that any new courses or curricula which departments might wish to offer by Summer School I must be submitted to the committee no later than the first Monday in January. All proposed course and curricula changes were approved with no discussion.

The Senate then considered a proposal of the committee for exceptional cases where hardship may be incurred by students enrolled in courses or curricula under modification. PROFESSOR SAFKO reported that according to the proposed motion all such cases would be reported to the Senate for information with the understanding that the Senate may disapprove the action taken by the committee. PROFESSOR HENRY PRICE, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM, objected to vagueness in the wording of the motion and raised the question as to who would initiate such an action. PROFESSOR PRICE also asked whether or not students could select the catalog under which they wish to graduate. PROFESSOR SAFKO gave examples of the types of circumstances with which this motion would deal. PROFESSOR PRICE then moved to amend the committee motion as follows (Amendment is underlined):

Amended  
Motion

In exceptional cases where hardship may be incurred by students currently enrolled in courses or curricula being modified, the University Committee on Curricula and Courses, upon initiation of the appropriate academic unit, shall have the discretionary authority to develop satisfactory arrangements for said students. All such cases shall be reported to the Senate for information with the understanding that the Senate may disapprove the action taken by the committee in this capacity.

In response to a question from PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK, LAW SCHOOL, PROFESSOR SAFKO clarified this motion would enable the Senate to disapprove an action by the committee in this capacity. The motion was adopted as amended.

D. Faculty Advisory Committee, Professor Charles B. Weasmer, Chairman:

PROFESSOR WEASMER read the following report to the Faculty Senate on the subject of faculty and intercollegiate athletics:

FAC  
Report on  
Faculty and  
Intercollegiate  
Athletics

The University Athletic Advisory Committee, as its name indicates, serves as an advisory committee to the Administration in its management of the program in intercollegiate athletics. In addition to its advisory function, the Committee attests to the academic eligibility of athletes. There is no requirement that the Committee's advice be sought or that its advice be taken when sought. The Committee responds to issues presented to it but does not undertake action upon its own initiative. It seems to be the attitude of both the Committee and the Administration that this advisory role is a useful and important function which should not be weakened.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association requires institutional control of intercollegiate athletics. Institutional control may include but in no way demands, faculty involvement in the control of intercollegiate athletics. The status of the faculty as comprising five members of the thirteen member University Athletic Advisory Committee is consistent with the NCAA Principles.

According to the Standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools "The administration and faculty must have the responsibility for and control of all intercollegiate athletics." What this means in terms of faculty involvement is not elaborated upon. The absence of adverse comments by the Southern Association would indicate that the USC arrangements are in compliance with this provision.

Both the NCAA and the Southern Association allow for but do not demand a larger role for the faculty than now exists regarding policy making and authority over athletics. The Faculty Manual could serve as the foundation for an expanded role by the faculty in that it gives to the faculty legislative powers in all matters pertaining to extracurricular activities. If the faculty desires for itself directly or through a faculty committee a greater voice in the athletic program, it is up to the faculty to speak for itself, defining the nature and scope of this enlarged role. The recent action by the Faculty Senate in redescribing the function of the University Athletic Advisory Committee could be interpreted to mean that the faculty is content with its advisory function.

Discussion  
of  
the  
Report

PROFESSOR WALTER REISER, LAW SCHOOL, inquired as to who determines whether or not a particular student is eligible academically to participate in athletic programs. PROFESSOR WEASMER responded that to the best of his committee's knowledge, it is done by the Athletic Advisory Committee. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, requested a response from a previous chairman of the Athletic Advisory Committee, PROFESSOR PETER BECKER, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, to Professor Weasmer's report.

PROFESSOR BECKER explained that he had not been able to literally understand (i.e. hear) everything that had been reported; that he would have preferred to have had this report submitted in writing along with the agenda; that he was not certain that he was in total agreement with the Faculty Advisory Committee; and that it appeared to him that the Faculty Advisory Committee report "overrates the participation of the faculty" on the Athletic Advisory Committee. PROFESSOR WEASMER responded by offering the following interpretation of his committee's report:

I am not certain how we could have overrated participation. I think our report says there is not great participation. What we tried to emphasize is that in short the faculty is not necessary. There is no requirement that the faculty constitute a committee for any purpose. It is purely a matter of advice. What I said in this report is that the NCAA regulations require institutional control which is not in any way faculty control. Likewise the Southern Association's ambiguous statement "The Administration and faculty must have the responsibility for and control of . . .". they did not elaborate upon that statement. There is no report from the Southern Association indicating that we are in any way at fault. Thus we assume what is being done is in accordance with the external requirements. The only question then is what might be done beyond the external minimal requirements. Our general view of the situation is the faculty has acquiesced in the reduction of its role. The role of the Athletic Committee has been redescribed so as to narrow

its activity. Our conclusion is that the faculty does not desire a more expanded role and if it does then to quote in my words "then it may speak for itself and take action". This will appear in the minutes as our response because there is no need to wait until February for our report.

PROFESSOR BECKER responded:

My reading of the regulation of the Southern Association when it says that the institution and the administration and the faculty should be involved in this. Then it seems to me that this should involve more than merely an advisory function of the faculty so that it seems to me that our current arrangement is not in compliance with the Southern Association but I am also aware that there is no precedence for this and no definitive answer. My point, I think my question, was primarily generated by my concern that the administration or that the faculty on the whole is not involved and is not listened to when it comes to athletic matters. I was questioning the role of the faculty on the Athletic Advisory Committee.

After his concluding remarks on the subject of the report of the faculty intercollegiate athletics, PROFESSOR WEASMER informed the Senate of a matter to be transmitted to the general faculty for their action. Specifically, the Faculty Advisory Committee will recommend a change in the method for filling vacancies on the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions as described on page 29 of the Faculty Manual. PROFESSOR WEASMER explained that the committee's motion to the general faculty will be as follows:

FAC Motion  
on T & P  
Committee  
Vacancies  
to be  
Submitted  
for General  
Faculty  
Action

We therefore propose that page 29 of the Faculty Manual be altered to delete the sentence "Extraordinary vacancies shall be filled as soon as possible by existing procedures for appointment or nomination and election." And the following sentence be put in its place: "The Committee shall establish the procedures and provisions for filling temporary vacancies on the Committee." This will go to the general faculty. The general faculty does not meet until sometime late in the spring term. There is some urgency to deal with this matter therefore we do not see a need for calling a special meeting of general faculty for this sole purpose. In lieu of that we propose then to send to the voting faculty by means of a mailed ballot.

There was no discussion of this matter.

E. Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee, Professor Trevor Howard-Hill, Chairman:

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL informed the Senate that the previous recommendations of the committee on the grade of "W" have been "permanently withdrawn". He also announced open meetings of the faculty to be held December 4 and 9 and indicated that on that basis his committee will decide whether or not to make another recommendation to the Senate with respect to the grade of "W". PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL also made a correction in the annual report of his committee, page A-7, requesting the deletion of the last line reading "NR: no report".

Turning to the committee's report for action at this Senate meeting: PROFESSOR HOWARD HILL moved the following:

Motion on  
Reporting Senior  
Grades Approved

The Committee recommends that departments and colleges do not require faculty to report grades for graduating seniors until after the last day of classes.

The motion was approved.

Motion on  
Final Exams  
for  
Seniors

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL moved the adoption of the following motion:

Final examinations for graduating seniors only may be given in the last week of classes.

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL reported that the committee's reasoning behind this recommendation was as follows:

Committee  
Rationale  
for  
Motion

There is an absolute requirement that all students must take final examinations. Graduating seniors can elect however to postpone and take an Incomplete which would mean that they presumably would not be able to graduate. The Committee did not think that it was desirable to allow graduating seniors to make arrangements very far before the week of the semester and felt that the most effective way of dealing with this particular problem would allow graduating

seniors to take an examination in the last week. This recommendation would make that possible.

Discussion of the Motion  
Motion Fails  
because PROFESSOR TED SIMPSON, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, spoke in opposition to this motion because "your policy does not pay much respect for final examinations . . . If graduating seniors don't need final examinations just who does?" PROFESSOR SIMPSON also explained that the statement on the commencement program indicates that the names of those listed are those who may graduate and "these are not necessarily graduating seniors", implying they have applied for a degree and they may graduate if their grades on final examinations are sufficient. PROFESSOR RUFUS FELLERS, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, spoke in support of the sentiments expressed by PROFESSOR SIMPSON, even if it meant delaying commencement by a week. The question was called and the motion failed.

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL moved the following with respect to the use of minus grades:

Motion on Minus Grades  
The Committee recommends the incorporation of minus grades into the present grading system, together with the appropriate amendments to the calculation of GPR etc.

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL explained that the recommendation of the committee for incorporation of minuses "was based largely on the principle that minuses are used in a large number of departments already for grades which are supplied to students and that the present scale of seven steps above F would allow for greater definement in grading if another four steps were incorporated . . .".

Discussion of the Motion  
requests because of pressure put on a professor to raise from a C+ to a B- . . .".  
PROFESSOR O. D. BONNER, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, spoke in opposition to the motion and stated that in his opinion the addition of plus grades four years ago has resulted in the inflation of grade point ratios. He also stated that the proposed system which would provide for 12 passing grades and argued that "it is impossible to divide students up into 12 actual groups of all students who have passed on the basis of 100 points . . .". He also predicted that the new system would lead to "a flood of grade change

being willing to agree "to something that is as far reaching as this". Specifically, PROFESSOR ECCLES asked:

For example a B+ is presently 4 to 3.5. Is the proposal going to be 3.33333 and to put A- as halfway between that A or is it going to leave the B+ as a 3 and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Then we have another problem. If we have an A+ is a straight A student a 4.0 if so then shouldn't he graduate with honors? And an A+ is a 4 and  $\frac{1}{2}$  maybe or should  $4\frac{1}{2}$  be not used at all and an A+ would be used for 4. Then a straight A student is by no means an honor student.

Motion to Recommit  
PROFESSOR ECCLES moved to recommit. The CHAIR ruled that this was a debateable motion.

Debate on Motion to Recommit  
PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL responded to Professor Eccles that "it was because of the large variety of numerical questions which are concerned in this we did not want to present an elaborate proposal without knowing the basic grading structure that the Senate wishes to agree to in principle". He explained that his committee's intent was to have the Senate decide what kind of a grading system we desire and then to have confidence in the committee, the Senate, and the Deans about "how this should be put into effect".

PROFESSOR ERNEST FURCHTGOTT, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, asked Professor Howard-Hill whether or not he consulted anybody with expertise in educational measurement because of the extensive literature available on this subject and because "you cannot discriminate more than about 7 points on almost any kind of measurement scale so I don't think that is going to produce more reliable grades."

Question Called  
Debate Limited  
Motion to Recommit Fails  
PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK LAW SCHOOL, called for the question (i.e. to terminate debate), Two-thirds of those senators present and voting voted to close debate. Therefore the CHAIR called for the question on recommitting the original motion of the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions to the committee. The motion to recommit failed. Therefore, discussion again returned to the original motion of the committee.

More Discussion of Motion on Minus Grades  
PROFESSOR BENJAMIN GIMARC, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, reiterated the sentiments of his colleague, Professor Bonner and described the proposal under debate as a "really ridiculous idea to increase the number of passing grades by almost doubling . . .". PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK acknowledged that he believes it is "instructive" to use the minus grading for the information of students but that he agreed with the problems that have been raised about increasing the numbers of potential grades.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, spoke in support of Professor Howard-Hill and the committee motion and argued "that it seems to me that there is a lot of difference between B- and B+ and if we are going to have the pluses why not have the minuses?"

PROFESSOR BARBARA TENENBAUM, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, spoke in favor of the proposal and shared her favorable experience at three previous institutions with the use of minus and plus grades. She argued that "there is a huge difference between C+ and a B". PROFESSOR COLLIN BENNETT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, argued "that the margin of error will be considerably cut down if we went to the plus-minus grading system".

PROFESSOR TED SIMPSON, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, spoke again in opposition to the motion and raised such questions as to how the Graduate School will accommodate itself to such a proposal and also how the proposal will effect the new suspension system based on a 24 grade point deficit.

PROFESSOR MARTIN WEINRICH, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, inquired as to whether or not the question pertained only to undergraduate grades. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL was asked by the CHAIR for clarification and the determination was that we are concerned only with undergraduate grades.

PROFESSOR ED MERCER, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, spoke in concurrence with his colleagues and in opposition to the motion. He spoke of the past history of problems getting the four independent grading systems "on the same system" and predicted that the proposed motion would "greatly complicate matters".

Motion Defeated                      The question was moved and the motion was defeated.

With respect to the grade of A+. PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL moved for the committee:

Motion to Add A+                      The Committee recommends the addition of A+ to the present grading system.

Rationale for the Motion                      PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL explained that the "sole argument" for this proposal was that this would provide a mechanism for awarding the occasional "exceptional students". PROFESSOR ROBERT CARLSSON, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, responded that it was his understanding that the way the A grade "is applied now does mean outstanding?" PROFESSOR CARLSSON asked "how can anyone be more outstanding than outstanding?"

Motion Defeated                      PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, concurred that the A grade means "outstanding" and that he did not believe there was "room to assign a grade above the A". The question was called and the motion was defeated.

PROFESSOR O. D. BONNER, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, made the following motion:

Motion to Survey Faculty Preferences on Grading System                      I think it would probably be beneficial to our committee who is considering our grading system to find the collective thought of the faculty as to how many passing grades we are supposed to have for students who are not failing and I think this would give some definitive information whether we should have two grades. Either you do very well or just get by or whether we should have twelve grades or fifteen grades. Maybe we should ask the faculty in the questionnaire how many passing grades you really think we ought to have for students who are not failing. I would like to propose that that questionnaire be submitted to the faculty.

Motion Deferred                      The CHAIR ruled the Senate would take note of the motion and reserve it for treatment after the committee had completed its report.

PROFESSOR HOWARD-HILL called the attention of the Senate to the attendance policy of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, as follows:

HSS Attendance Policy Presented                      Enrollment in a course obligates the student not only for prompt completion of all work assigned but also for punctual and regular attendance and for participation in whatever class discussion may occur. It is the student's responsibility to keep informed concerning all assignments made. Absences whether excused or unexcused do not absolve him from this responsibility.

Absence from more than 10% of the scheduled class sessions whether excused or unexcused is excessive and the instructor may choose to exact a grade penalty for such absences.

The CHAIR explained to the Senate that the matter was being conveyed for the information of the Senate and that the Senate had a right to disapprove this policy, that questions and comments were in order, and that if no negative motion was forthcoming the Senate would proceed to the next item of business.



Discussion of HSS Policy After obtaining clarification about this matter of information and its procedure, PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, argued that this particular policy "is exceedingly ill-conceived" and urged that it not be approved before the Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee returned with further recommendations. PROFESSOR MOORE moved to table the attendance policy of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The CHAIR ruled the motion out of order. The CHAIR requested that Associate Dean Thorne Compton of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences comment on the policy. DEAN COMPTON spoke as follows:

Comments of HSS Associate Dean Requested In the fall of last year, actually the spring the year before that, the Faculty Senate heard the proposal from the Department of Art in our College to have an attendance policy that applied to those courses and their courses alone. The rationale was it was a performance field and they needed it for their students to regulate their performance in a different way than it was specified in the catalogue. When it came before our college faculty for approval it was asked of our college's standards and petitions committee that we come up with a college policy. When this policy came to the Faculty Senate it was again suggested that we consider a college policy. Our Scholastic Standards and Petitions Committee took that in good faith and developed over a period of several months a policy on attendance for our college that would take in the needs of music and art and theatre performance areas as well as the general lecture courses. It came up before our college faculty. It was a long meeting and we discussed extensively. We have been waiting since last spring for the thing to come before the Senate so that it could be implemented and that is the history of this proposal.

Motion to Disapprove HSS Attendance Policy

PROFESSOR DANIEL SABIA, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, urged the Senate to disapprove this policy on the procedural grounds previously argued by Professor Moore, namely, the Senate might adopt a policy at the University level which would contradict this college policy and therefore we should determine first an appropriate University policy. PROFESSOR SABIA also opposed the proposed college policy, per se, and argued that the students be graded based on their academic performance and not attendance. PROFESSOR SABIA moved that the Senate disapprove the proposed attendance policy of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Discussion of Motion to Disapprove

PROFESSOR GUNTHER HOLST, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, reminded the Senate that his college faculty had overwhelmingly approved this proposed policy. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, concurred with the veracity of Professor Holst's remarks but added that his college faculty had "made a horrendous mistake . . . we are here for the purpose of hopefully correcting their mistake".

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, urged the Senate "not to allow our inability to formulate a University-wide attendance policy to deny the College of Humanities and Social Sciences an opportunity to implement their own . . ." and suggested that if eventually a "better University-wide attendance policy is approved by this body it may well indeed supercede the college's attendance policy. . ." PROFESSOR LANE also pointed out to the Senate that the proposal, in her opinion, "has absolutely no teeth in it at all . . . it says the instructor may choose to exact a grade penalty . . . it forces no one to exact any grade penalty for anyone who is absent". PROFESSOR CHARLES WEASMER, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, urged that the Senate defer to the judgement of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

PROFESSOR JAMES BUGGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, spoke in opposition to the motion to disapprove the college policy for reasons stated by previous senators.

PROFESSOR HAL FRENCH, RELIGIOUS STUDIES, shared his recollection of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences faculty meeting at which this policy was adopted. PROFESSOR FRENCH reported that he remembered "considerable disagreement within the college" and that it was his opinion that the proposal comes to the Senate no "anywhere near unanimity".

PROFESSOR ROBERT CARLSSON, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, argued that "in the absence of any argument showing that this is going to be detrimental or disastrous or what may happen from the standpoint of the University, I think that the Senate should support the college". PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, informed the Senate that he was not present at the college faculty meeting when the policy was adopted but that had he been present "I certainly would have spoken against the policy and voted against it". PROFESSOR ABERNATHY argued that it is necessary to protect the student from "using matters other than academic performance as a basis for students' grades" and "that this is an excessive absence requirement or attendance requirement".

Question Called  
Debate Terminated.  
Motion to  
Disapprove HSS  
Policy Fails

PROFESSOR NANCY LANE, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, called for the question. The CHAIR ruled that there was a two-thirds vote in favor of terminating debate. The CHAIR called for the original question and ruled that a vote in favor of Professor Sabia's motion constitutes a vote to disapprove the College of Humanities and Social Sciences attendance policy. The motion to disapprove the College of Humanities and Social Sciences attendance policy failed.

of Professor Bonner. Therefore, PROFESSOR O. D. BONNER, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, moved:

Motion for  
Survey and  
Faculty  
Preferences on  
Grading System

That the faculty be polled for the information of ~~that~~ the committee considering the grade change and be asked to state their preferences as to how many passing grades the University should have used in doing other than failing work in a course. This is for the information of the committee.

Motion  
Defeated

The CHAIR inquired as to whether or not this poll was to be administered by the Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions and PROFESSOR BONNER responded in the affirmative. PROFESSOR BENJAMIN GIMARC, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, spoke against the motion. It was Professor Gimarc's interpretation that if the Senate were to defeat this motion it would "put to rest for another two years any program to change the grading system". The CHAIR called for the question and the motion was defeated.

F. Student Affairs Committee, Professor A. Jerome Jewler, Chairman:

PROFESSOR JEWLER introduced his report (attached to the agenda of December 2, 1981) with the following opening statement:

Rationale  
for  
Committee  
Proposal

Two years ago USC's Self-Study addressed the problem of student discipline and recommended a revision in the present system. In numerous interviews with members of the Division of Student Affairs, Student Government, Law School faculty and University faculty and staff members who have been assigned to the Student Court System, the Self-Study group learned among other things that the Student Courts were dominated by graduate students, were more legalistic in nature than the situation required and that the legal jargon was confusing not only to the student under review but the student and faculty judges as well. Also, the Division of Student Affairs was charged with a responsibility of administering the system but they also lacked specific authority to do so. Subsequently, President Holderman appointed a task force to review and revise this and under the direction of H. E. Barrineau, Associate Dean of the College of Criminal Justice, this task force produced a proposal for a revised system which insures fundamental fairness to every student accused of social misconduct on campus. The Student Affairs Committee reviewed this proposal. During our review it was endorsed by faculty, students and staff including representatives of the Student Government. I would now present it for your consideration.

PROFESSOR ELDON WEDLOCK, LAW SCHOOL, raised a number of questions and objections to this proposal, in summary, as follows:

1. Problems in the meaning of the term "deposition" used in the document.
2. What is meant by the terminology "show cause"?
3. The exact nature of the "right to counsel".
4. The meaning of the phrase "be judged guilty only according to what a reasonable person believes to have occurred based upon the information introduced during the hearing".
5. Questionable procedures during the hearing stage after guilt is determined.
6. The terminology "suspension held in abeyance".
7. Who makes the determination as to whether or not the student had any previous or serious violations of the rules and regulations?

8. The distinction between a "regular" and an "irregular" hearing?
9. Problems in the language describing the functions and mechanics of the judicial appeal board.

Motion to  
Table  
Approved

After raising the above objections PROFESSOR WEDLOCK moved to table the proposal of the Student Affairs Committee. PROFESSOR CHARLES WEASMER, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, offered the interpretation that a motion to table was not the same as a motion to recommit. The CHAIR ruled that the motion was not debateable. The motion to table was approved.

#### IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

#### V. Unfinished Business.

No unfinished business.

#### VI. New Business.

PROFESSOR O. D. BONNER, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, informed the Senate of a Gamecock article on November 18th announcing the availability of Shuttlecock transportation to the Columbia Airport on Sunday November 22. PROFESSOR BONNER moved "that the Senate express its disapproval of encouragement of students presumably with its blessings from those who are responsible for the Shuttlecock and encouragement of students to cut two days of classes before the holidays". The CHAIR requested the clarification as to which University authority this expression of disapproval was to be directed. PROFESSOR BONNER responded that the appropriate authorities were those "who authorize the Shuttlecock to give rides on Sunday when there are two days of classes left". The CHAIR asked for Senator Bonner to repeat his motion. The motion was repeated as follows:

Motion of  
Disapproval  
Approved

That the Senate express disapproval of encouraging students to cut two classes before a holiday by furnishing free shuttle rides to the airport.

The motion was approved.

#### VII. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, commented that he thought the Senate had made "a bad mistake" in its action with respect to the attendance policy of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The CHAIR ruled Professor Moore's comments out of order. The CHAIR then recognized Senator Moore for an additional remark regarding the Senator's finding of "great wisdom" in a procedure for chairperson selection announced on a bulletin board at the University of Missouri as reported in an edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education.

#### VIII. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

Election to  
Faculty House  
Board of  
Governors

The CHAIR reopened the floor for additional nominations to the Faculty House Board of Governors and there being none forthcoming declared Professor David Husband, Department of Biology, elected.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.